



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/603,500	06/24/2003	Prasad Miriyala	CISCP109C1/7872	3636
22434	7590	04/20/2007	EXAMINER	
BEYER WEAVER LLP P.O. BOX 70250 OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250			SOL, ANTHONY M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2616	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		04/20/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/603,500	MIRIYALA, PRASAD
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Anthony Sol	2616

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication; even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 1999.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-42 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 24 June 1999 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 29 is objected to because of the following informalities:

For claim 29, line 4, it is believed that "device the non-ATM address" should state "device having the non-ATM address".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

It is not clear what is meant by "the shared non-ATM network address is a standby group IP address and the one or more packets destined for the standby group IP address." The phrase "the one or more packets destined for the standby group IP address" seems to be incomplete or a typo. The Examiner has not been able to ascertain what the Applicant meant to state.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1- 16, 18-24, 26-38 and 40-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,665,304 B2 (“Beck”).

Regarding claims 1, 20, 24, 33, and 42,

Beck shows in fig. 7 a standby group of ATM network devices (*processor nodes 10a, 10b, 10c*) within an ATM network (col. 10, lines 64-67, *high-speed communications interface, e.g. ATM*), each ATM network device within the standby group having its own ATM address (S1.A, S1.B, S1.C) and sharing a non-ATM network address with other members of the standby group (col. 11, lines 17-22, 40-45, *cluster alias address*).

Beck further shows in fig. 7 a server (*network router 25*) which is configured to determine that a first member (*processor node A 10a*) of the standby group of network devices is not available to provide the network service and identify a second member (*processor node B 10b*) of the standby group of network devices to provide the network service, wherein the determination by the server is performed based on at least one of i) detecting that the first member has not opened a virtual circuit within a predetermined period, and detecting that the first member has not sent a KEEP ALIVE message within a predetermined period (col. 12, lines 14 to col. 13, line 63, see in particular col. 13,

lines 9-11, *For illustration purposes, consider that processor node 10a is the preferred path to subnet S1. When processor node 10a crashes, the network router will stop getting responses to its queries. After a predetermined period of time has expired, the routing daemon 21 will timeout while waiting for a response from processor node 10a).*

6. Regarding claim 2,

Beck discloses that of the three processor nodes 10a-10c, the network router 25 typically selects one to use as a preferred path to subnet S1 (col. 13, lines 3-5).

7. Regarding claim 3,

Beck discloses high-speed communications interface, e.g. ATM, that connects all members of the cluster (col. 10, lines 63-66).

8. Regarding claims 4 and 27,

Beck shows in fig. 2 processor nodes 10a-10c in a "subnet S1" 22 having a virtual connection to network router 25 (col. 4, lines 21-28, col. 11, lines 30-45, col. 12, lines 50-65).

9. Regarding claim 5,

Beck discloses use of ARP protocol in the subnet (col. 11, lines 30 to col. 12, lines 13).

10. Regarding claims 6 and 7,

Beck shows in fig. 7 a virtual subnet S3, wherein each processor node associated with a virtual subnet “advertise” the location of that virtual subnet to router

25. Beck discloses that each processor node 10 in the cluster 24 uses IP routing to advertise itself as a network route to the associated virtual subnet (col. 11, lines 30-39).

11. Regarding claim 8,

Beck discloses when processor node 10a crashes, the network router will stop getting responses to its queries (col. 13, lines 9-11).

12. Regarding claim 9,

Beck discloses that each network router maintains a map database that indicates available network paths over which data packets can be sent to reach particular processor nodes (col. 12, lines 54-57).

13. Regarding claims 10, 11, 12, 13, 16 and 22,

Beck discloses that processor nodes 10b and 10c arbitrate among themselves to determine which one will acquire the network layer address of processor node 10a (col. 13, lines 43-45).

14. Regarding claim 14,

Beck discloses the use of ARP protocol and how daemon processes 21 queries

the processor nodes and network routers to which it is connected to find out which processor nodes and network routers they are connected to. Beck further discloses that if processor node 10a crashes, processor nodes 10b and 10c arbitrate to determine which one will acquire the network layer address of processor node 10a. Beck further discloses that accordingly, the routing daemon 21 puts together a table of routes from the router to each processor node (col. 11, line 49 to col. 13, line 59).

15. Regarding claim 15,

Beck shows in fig. 7 a standby group of ATM network devices (*processor nodes 10a, 10b, 10c*) within an ATM network (col. 10, lines 64-67, *high-speed communications interface, e.g. ATM*), each ATM network device within the standby group having its own ATM address (S1.A, S1.B, S1.C) and sharing a non-ATM network address with other members of the standby group (col. 11, lines 17-22, 40-45, *cluster alias address*).

Beck further shows in fig. 7 a server (*network router 25*) which is configured to determine that the first network device (processor node 10b) is available by at least one of (i) detecting that the first network device has opened a virtual circuit within a predetermined period, and (ii) detecting that the first network device has sent a KEEP ALIVE message within a predetermined period (col. 12, lines 14 to col. 13, line 63, see in particular col. 12, line 67 to col. 13, line 3, *A routing daemon 21 that queries processing nodes 10a-10c generates a map indicating that each of those processor nodes can be used as paths to subnet S1*).

Beck discloses that the server is configured to send a notification identifying the first network device by ATM address (S1.B) and the shared non-ATM network address (*cluster alias address associated with a virtual subnet S3*) and receive one or more packets destined for the shared non-ATM network address (col. 12, lines 14-34).

16. Regarding claim 18,

Beck discloses that the cluster management application sends a message to the other processor nodes within the cluster when one of those processor nodes crashes. Beck further discloses that nodes 10b and 10c arbitrate among themselves to determine which one will acquire the network layer address of processor node 10a (col. 13, lines 38-45).

17. Regarding claim 19,

Beck discloses cluster alias address associated with virtual subnet S3. Beck discloses that the route to the virtual subnet address are advertised using common IP routing protocol (col. 12, lines 14-22).

18. Regarding claims 21, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38,

Beck discloses that one or **more** cluster alias addresses may be "configured" in a virtual or physical subnet (col. 11, lines 40-45).

19. Regarding claim 23,

Beck shows in fig. 7 a network device (*processor node 10a*) in the ATM network (col. 10, lines 64-67, *high-speed communications interface, e.g. ATM*), the network device having at least one non-ATM network address (col. 11, lines 17-22, 40-45, *cluster alias address*).

Beck further shows in fig. 7 a server (*network router 25*) which is configured to assign the network device to a group of network devices having a shared non-ATM network address (col. 11, lines 17-22, 40-45, *cluster alias address*) and to determine whether the network device is not available by at least one of (i) determining whether the network device has not opened a virtual circuit within a predetermined period, and (ii) determining whether the network device has not sent a KEEP ALIVE message within a predetermined period (col. 12, lines 14 to col. 13, line 63, see in particular col. 13, lines 9-11, *For illustration purposes, consider that processor node 10a is the preferred path to subnet S1. When processor node 10a crashes, the network router will stop getting responses to its queries. After a predetermined period of time has expired, the routing daemon 21 will timeout while waiting for a response from processor node 10a*).

Beck discloses that if the network device is not available, change the network device from an active status in which the network device services the non-ATM network address to a standby status in which the network device does not service the non-ATM network address (col. 13, lines 55-59, *After the routing failover period has expired, the routers will not send data packets to processor node 10a*).

Art Unit: 2616

20. Regarding claim 26,

Beck discloses high-speed communications interface, e.g. ATM (col. 10, lines 64-67).

21. Regarding claim 28,

Beck discloses cluster alias address (col. 11, lines 17-22, 40-45).

22. Regarding claims 29 and 32,

Beck discloses use of a bitmask, referred to as "subnet mask," that is "ANDed" with the identified destination address, e.g. the cluster alias address (col. 11, lines 14-19).

23. Regarding claim 30,

Beck discloses a map database (col. 12, lines 51-65).

24. Regarding claim 31,

Beck discloses a table of routes (col. 12, lines 51-65).

25. Regarding claim 40,

Beck shows in fig. 7, a network router 25.

26. Regarding claim 41,

Beck shows in fig. 7, a Subnet S2 with ATM addresses S2.B and S2.C.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

27. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

28. Claims 17, 25 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beck in view of RFC 2225 Classical IP and ARP over ATM ("RFC 2225").

Regarding claims 17, 25 and 39,

Beck does not disclose that the server is configured to send an ATMARP request.

RFC 2225 discloses in an SVC environment, ATMARP servers are used to resolve target IP addresses to target ATM address via an ATMARP request and reply protocol and that ATMARP servers must have authoritative responsibility for resolving ATMARP requests of all IP members using SVCs located within the LIS (Section 5.2).

It would have been *prima facie* obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method for providing an integrated cluster alias address of Beck to use an ATMARP request as taught by RFC 2225. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to make the combination for the purpose of resolving target IP addresses to target ATM address (RFC 2225, Section 5.2).

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Burnett (US5633869) teaches virtual network using asynchronous transfer mode.

Miyao (US5889777) teaches network server.

Miriyala (US6618377B1) teaches flexible scheduling of network devices within redundant aggregate configurations.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony Sol whose telephone number is (571) 272-5949. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30am - 4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hassan Kizou can be reached on (571) 272-3088. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



HASSAN KIZOU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600

AMS

4/9/2007